

March 11, 2016

Barry Wood
Director Assessment Division
Department of Local Government Finance
Indiana Government Center North
100 North Senate Avenue N1058(B)
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Dear Barry,

We have completed the sales ratio study for the 2016 Gibson County trending. All sales that we deemed valid were used, including multi-parcel sales and land sales that have since been improved. We only used sales between 1/1/15-12/31/15. For the second year of the cyclical reassessment, we reviewed Barton, Center, Columbia, Union, Washington, White River, and Wabash Townships on the Commercial/Industrial, Exempt, and Utility side. In addition to those areas, we reviewed Center and Montgomery Townships for Agricultural and Residential. Also, we reviewed the western part of Princeton for Agricultural and Residential.

Residential and Ag Homesites

For the “Res Vacant” portion of the ratio study we grouped the following townships together:

Barton
Center
Columbia
Montgomery
Patoka
Union
Wabash
Washington
White River

The townships were grouped together because they share similar economic factors. This allowed us to include all sales in a similar area, rather than basing land rates on one or two sales. Rates were changed where necessary. Johnson Township was not grouped with these because it has seen more development.

Also, we grouped the following townships together for the “Improved Residential” portion of the ratio study:

Barton
Center
Wabash
Washington
White River

We grouped these townships together because of the similarities they share economically. The following townships were not grouped with any other township. There were a representative number of sales to tell us what the market was doing in each area. Also, trending factors have been added to help bring the median ratios closer to 1.00. The townships that weren't grouped with any other township are:

Columbia
Johnson
Montgomery
Patoka
Union

There is one parcel that caused a decrease of 10.4% in Columbia Township for the "Res Vacant". This parcel had an improvement removed from the property. The parcel:

26-13-35-200-000.374-006

There are several parcels that were created/split out that caused the "Res Vacant" in Johnson Township to increase more than 34%. Those parcels are:

26-18-36-400-000.867-009
26-18-36-400-000.868-009
26-18-36-400-000.869-009
26-18-36-400-000.872-009
26-18-36-400-000.873-009
26-19-35-400-002.678-024
26-19-35-400-002.679-024
26-19-35-400-002.680-024
26-22-04-200-002.629-024
26-23-06-200-000.874-009
26-23-16-200-002.622-024
26-23-16-200-002.675-024
26-23-16-200-002.676-024
26-23-18-100-002.681-024

Montgomery Township "Res Vacant" saw a decrease of 16.5%. There were 3 parcels that had structures removed. Those parcels are:

26-17-02-400-005.012-021
26-17-04-400-001.402-021
26-17-17-300-004.421-021

Patoka Township "Res Vacant" saw a decrease of 15.7%. There were 6 parcels that had buildings removed that were the major contributors to this. Those parcels are:

26-12-19-200-001.213-027
26-11-12-203-002.083-028
26-12-18-203-001.806-028
26-12-07-401-002.090-028
26-12-07-201-003.050-028
26-12-07-103-003.175-028

Commercial and Industrial

We grouped all of the Commercial and Industrial properties together. The construction types and sizes for the Commercial and Industrial properties are very similar, so these two categories were grouped together when we were developing trending factors. They are grouped that way on the ratio study as well. Trending factors were added to help bring the median ratios closer to 1.00, if they were needed at all.

Barton Township “Industrial Imp” increased just over 10%. This was due to new construction to the following parcel:

26-20-22-200-000.116-001

Columbia Township “Commercial Imp” increased 17.5%. This was due to a couple of reasons. There was a very large addition built on one parcel. Also, there was a change in use on a few others. The parcels that caused the increase are:

26-13-24-200-000.673-007
26-14-18-304-000.870-007
26-14-19-102-000.260-007
26-14-18-304-000.283-007
26-14-18-402-000.612-006
26-14-19-101-000.366-007

Center Township “Commercial Imp” increased around 24%. This was due to new construction and change in use to some buildings. The parcels below are the ones that influenced this 24% change the most:

26-13-18-300-000.824-004
26-12-24-100-701.666-004
26-13-19-202-000.244-005
26-13-18-403-000.360-005
26-12-23-100-000.233-004

Johnson Township “Commercial Imp” decreased just over 10%. There are seven parcels responsible for this. The drop in value was caused by a drop in land value in one neighborhood. There have been some appeals in this area, and asking prices for land have dropped significantly. The parcels are:

26-23-05-300-000.582-024
26-23-17-100-001.912-024
26-23-17-200-001.880-024
26-23-17-300-000.738-024
26-23-17-400-000.479-024
26-23-17-400-002.535-024
26-23-17-400-002.539-024

Johnson Township “Commercial Vac” decreased 41.3%. The drop in value was caused by a drop in land value in one neighborhood. There have been some appeals in this area, and asking prices for land have dropped significantly. The parcels that caused the decrease are:

26-23-17-100-002.286-024
26-23-17-104-001.946-024
26-23-17-300-002.072-024
26-23-17-400-002.578-024

Summary

Almost all of our neighborhoods that had a representative number of sales fell within acceptable range and if they did not, we applied a factor to get them to meet IAAO standards. Any areas that didn't have a fair representation of sales were combined with an adjoining area of similar economic factors.

Sincerely,

Kim Minkler